

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Johnnie G. Bryant, Jr.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Springleaf Financial Services, Inc. f/k/a
American General Finance, Inc.,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:12-cv-02300-TLW

Springleaf Financial Services of South
Carolina, Inc., f/k/a American General
Financial Services, Inc.,

Counterclaim Plaintiff,

vs.

Johnnie G. Bryant, Jr. a/k/a Johnnie Gary
Bryant, Jr. a/k/a Johnny Bryant a/k/a
Johnnie Bryant; and Johnnie Brandon
Bryant a/k/a Johnnie B. Bryant a/k/a
Johnny Bryant a/k/a Johnnie Bryant,

Counterclaim Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff Johnnie G. Bryant, Jr. instituted this action against Springleaf Financial Services on August 12, 2012. (Doc. #1). Springleaf filed an Answer and Counterclaim against Plaintiff and his son, Johnnie B. Bryant, on November 7, 2012. (Doc. #8). Plaintiff and Springleaf have resolved their claims against each other, and only Springleaf's counterclaim against Johnnie B. Bryant remains. The Clerk made an entry of default against Johnnie B. Bryant on February 11, 2014. (Doc. #58). On March 5, 2014, Springleaf filed a motion for default judgment as to

Johnnie B. Bryant. (Doc. #62). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court referred this action to a Magistrate Judge for the purposes of conducting a hearing and preparing a Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) on the motion for default judgment. (Doc. #69). This matter is now before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Thomas E. Rogers, III. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court grant Springleaf’s motion for default judgment and enter default judgment against Johnnie B. Bryant in the amount of \$129,838.42. (Doc. #78). Johnnie B. Bryant’s objections to the Report were due by March 2, 2015. He has filed no objections, and this matter is ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Furthermore, a party’s failure to file specific written objections to the Report waives the right to appellate review of that claim. See id. at 315-16.

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report in accordance with this standard and concludes that it accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #78). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, Springleaf’s motion for default

judgment is **GRANTED** (Doc. #62), and judgment is entered against Johnnie B. Bryant in the amount of \$129,838.42.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

March 23, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina